

MELINDA HAAG (CABN 132612)
United States Attorney

MIRANDA KANE (CABN 150630)
Chief, Criminal Division

LOWELL C. POWELL (CABN 235446)
Special Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7368
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
E-Mail: lowell.powell2@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
DANIEL GONZALEZ VENEGAS,)
)
Defendant.)

No. CR 11-680 WHA

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER 18
U.S.C. § 3161**

On October 18, 2011, the parties in this case appeared before the Court. At that time, the Court set the matter to November 15, 2011. The parties have agreed to exclude the period of time between October 18, 2011 and November 15, 2011, from any time limits applicable under 18 U.S.C. § 3161. The parties represented that granting the exclusion would allow the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of counsel. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties also agree that the ends of justice served by granting such an exclusion of time outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

\\

STIPULATION & ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
CR 11-0680 WHA

1 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). At the hearing, the Court made findings consistent with this
2 agreement. SO STIPULATED:

3
4 MELINDA HAAG
United States Attorney

5
6 DATED: October 20, 2011

7 /s/
LOWELL C. POWELL
Special Assistant United States Attorney

8
9 DATED: October 20, 2011

10 /s/
JODI LINKER
Attorney for DANIEL GONZALEZ VENEGAS

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
STIPULATION & ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
CR 11-0680 WHA

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

For the reasons stated above and at the October 18, 2011 hearing, the Court finds that the exclusion from the time limits applicable under 18 U.S.C. § 3161 of the period from October 18, 2011 through November 15, 2011 is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(A). Denying the requested exclusion of time would deprive the parties of the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 20, 2011.



William Alsup
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE